



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,435	10/23/2003	Brandon Vaughn Taylor	MSFT-2571/302767.1	8406
41505	7590	11/14/2008	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			LAI, MICHAEL C	
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR				
2929 ARCH STREET				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2457	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/692,435	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAYLOR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL C. LAI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,10,12-19,21-23 and 25-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,10,12-19,21-23 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |



### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 9/10/2008. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10, 12-19, 21-23, 25-28 have been examined.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 4, 13, 18, and the cancelled claims 3, 20.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 18-19, 21-22, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti et al. ("The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices", March 2002, ACM Press, hereinafter referred to as Roccetti), in view of Schilit et al. ("m-Links: An Infrastructure for Very Small Internet Devices", July 2001, ACM Press, pages 122-131, hereinafter referred to as Schilit), and further in view of Mineyama (US 2003/0126088 A1, hereinafter referred to as Mineyama).

Regarding claim 1, Roccetti discloses a method for distributing content over a communications network, comprising:

logging on to a server by a web-enabled device (the gateway system accepts and manages all the requests for songs arriving from the client connected to a given UMTS terminal, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 1);

generating a list of accessible content available at the server ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

providing the list to the web-enabled device ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

selecting a particular accessible content from the list of accessible content at the web-enabled device ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

transmitting the selection to the server (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2);

retrieving the selected content from a storage associated with the server (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2); and

electronically transmitting from the server the selected accessible content to the one or more designated devices (download session, page 1068, column 2, and paragraph 2).

Roccetti substantially discloses all the limitations in claim 1. However, Roccetti is silent about **the fax server** and **sending destination information to the fax server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the**

**web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content.**

However, Schilit teaches the Mobile Link (m-Links) infrastructure for utilizing existing World Wide Web content and services on wireless phones and other very small Internet terminals (see Abstract and Figure 6). The m-Links infrastructure supports fax services to deliver hard copies of the contents of links to internet device users. The services accept the target link and prompt the user for **a fax number**. It then downloads the document and sends it as an email attachment to the fax service (see Sections 1.2 and 5.3). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Schilit into the method of Roccetti at the time of the invention to send information to the fax server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Roccetti and Schilit disclose the claimed invention, but are silent about "authenticating the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list" and "providing the list to the web-enabled device, the list including only content that is accessible to the authenticated web-enabled device from all the content available at the fax server". However, Mineyama discloses an authenticating server and a content server that authenticating the user before providing the subscribed content list to the user (paragraphs 0076-0077, 0098-0099). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2457

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Mineyama into the method of Roccetti and Schilit in order to prevent unauthorized access to content or document in a web system, thereby, providing secured remote content/document retrieval.

Regarding claim 2, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising receiving a request for content distribution from the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 4, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 3, further comprising receiving login information at the web-enabled device, and transmitting the login information to the server, wherein authenticating the web-enabled device comprises authenticating the login information (Mineyama, paragraphs 0076-0077). See motivation above.

Regarding claim 13, Roccetti disclose a method for initiating the electronic distribution of content over a communications network, comprising:

generating a list of accessible content available at the fax server associated with the authenticated device, the content having been provided by a first party associated with a device (Roccetti, "top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

providing the list to the device ("top-10 service", page 1069, paragraph 1);

receiving, at the device, a selection of accessible content from the list (Roccetti, "top-10 service", page 1069, paragraph 1);

transmitting the selection to the server (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2); and

retrieving the selected accessible content from storage associated with the server (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Roccetti is silent about sending address/location information associated to a designated device to the server from the device, the designated device being different from the device; and sending the selected accessible content to the designated device using the address/location information. However, Schilit teaches the Mobile Link (m-Links) infrastructure for utilizing existing World Wide Web content and services on wireless phones and other very small Internet terminals (see Abstract and Figure 6). The m-Links infrastructure supports fax services to deliver hard copies of the contents of links to internet device users. The services accept the target link and prompt the user for **a fax number**. It then downloads the document and sends it as an email attachment to the fax service (see Sections 1.2 and 5.3). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Schilit into the method of Roccetti at the time of the invention to send information to the fax server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for



Art Unit: 2457

remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Roccetti and Schilit substantially disclose the invention as claimed. However, Roccetti and Schilit are silent about login information and authentication. However, Mineyama discloses a method of:

- transmitting login information to a server from a device (paragraph 0076);
- authenticating the login information at the server (paragraph 0077);
- generating a list of accessible content at the server associated with the authenticated device, the content having been provided by a first party associated with a device (paragraphs 0098, 0099).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Mineyama into the method of Roccetti and Schilit in order to prevent unauthorized access to content or document in a web system, thereby, providing secured remote content/document retrieval.

Regarding claim 14, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 13, Roccetti further discloses comprising receiving a request for content distribution from the device, prior to generating the list (download session, page 1068, column 2, and paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 18, Roccetti discloses a system for distributing content to a designated device, comprising:

a web-enabled device that can receive and provide a listing of content (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1);

a server with an associated storage device, the storage device maintaining content that had been previously provided by a first party associated with the web-enabled device to the storage, the server generating the listing of content to the web-enabled device, providing the listing to the web-enabled device, receiving a selection of content from the web-enabled device, retrieving the selected content, and electronically transmitting the selected content to the designated device selected by the web-enabled device (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1); and

a communications network between the device and the server (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1).

Roccetti substantially discloses the invention as claimed. However, Roccetti is silent about the web-enabled device that is different from the designated device.

However, Schilit teaches the Mobile Link (m-Links) infrastructure for utilizing existing World Wide Web content and services on wireless phones and other very small Internet terminals (see Abstract and Figure 6). The m-Links infrastructure supports fax services to deliver hard copies of the contents of links to internet device users. The services accept the target link and prompt the user for a fax number. It then downloads the document and sends it as an email attachment to the fax service (see Sections 1.2 and 5.3). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Schilit into the method of Roccetti

at the time of the invention to send information to the fax server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Roccetti and Schilit disclose the claimed invention, but are silent about "an authentication system for authenticating the web-enabled device" and "wherein the listing provided to the web-enabled device only includes content that is accessible to the web-enabled device based on its authentication". However, Mineyama discloses an authenticating server and a content server that authenticating the user before providing the subscribed content list to the user (paragraphs 0076-0077, 0098-0099). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Mineyama into the system of Roccetti and Schilit in order to prevent unauthorized access to content or document in a web system, thereby, providing secured remote content/document retrieval.

Regarding claim 19, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the web-enabled device sends a request for content distribution to the server to activate the server generating the listing of content. (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 21, Roccetti and Schilit disclose the system according to claim 18, but are silent about wherein the web-enabled device is adapted to receive login information and provide the login information to the server for authentication. However,

Art Unit: 2457

Mineyama discloses a system of receiving login information at the device, and transmitting the login information to the server, wherein authenticating the device comprises authenticating the login information (paragraphs 0076-0077). Roccetti does mention that security issues have not been addressed and will be their future research topic (page 1073, paragraph 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Mineyama into the system of Roccetti and Schilit at the time of the invention to provide a way of authentication using the login information in order to enhance the security of Roccetti's and Schilit's system.

Regarding claim 22, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the server transmits the content to a phone number, fax number, or address associated with the designated device (Roccetti, address, page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1. Note that Langseth also discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (col. 23, lines 1-10)).

Regarding claim 26, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the communications network is the internet (Roccetti, page 1068, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 27, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the communications network is a LAN or WAN (LAN and WAN are well known in the art).

Regarding claim 28, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the content comprises at least one of documents (Schilit Section 1.2, second paragraph, "product brochures"), pictures (Schilit Section 2, first paragraph, "images"), and data.

3. Claims 5, 7, 15-16, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama, and further in view of Langseth et al. (US 6,671,715 B1), hereinafter referred to as Langseth.

Regarding claim 5, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about receiving a phone number, fax number, or address for the one or more designated device at the server from the web-enabled device, prior to electronically transmitting the selected accessible content. However, Langseth discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (claim 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the method of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to receive a phone number, fax number, or address for the one or more designated device, prior to electronically transmitting the selected accessible content. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's method would be to enable transmitting the content to specified destination/device.

Regarding claim 7, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about receiving and displaying the list on the browser

of the web-enabled device. However, Langseth further discloses the device comprises a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the web-enabled device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the web-enabled device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

Regarding claim 15, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama do not disclose the use of a phone number, fax number, or address for the designated device for transmitting the content. However, Langseth discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (claim 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to receive a phone number, fax number, or address for the designated device, prior to electronically transmitting the content, and electronically transmitting the content to the designated device comprises electronically transmitting the content to the received phone number or address. The motivation would be to enable Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system to transmit the content to specified destination/device.

Regarding claim 16, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama don't disclose receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device. However, Langseth further discloses

Art Unit: 2457

the device comprises a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

Regarding claim 23, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama are silent about wherein the web-enabled device includes a browser that displays the listing. However, Langseth further discloses the web-enabled device includes a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

4. Claims 12, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama, and further in view of Y. Chen et al. ("iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform", July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Volume 9 , Issue 4), hereinafter referred to as Y. Chen.

Regarding Claim 12, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about publicly accessible devices. However, Y.

Art Unit: 2457

Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to further comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system would be to enable Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system to be accessible to more people.

Regarding Claim 17, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama don't disclose publicly accessible devices. However, Y. Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to further comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system would be to enable Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system to be accessible to more people.

Regarding Claim 25, Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama are silent about publicly accessible devices. However, Y. Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama at the time of the invention to further



Art Unit: 2457

comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation would be to enable Roccetti's, Schilit's and Mineyama's system to be accessible to more people.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama, in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Roccetti, Schilit and Mineyama disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about wherein electronically transmitting comprises fax over IP. However, fax over IP is well known in the art as admitted by the applicant (paragraph 0003). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use fax over IP to do electronically transmitting contents. The motivation would be that fax over IP is cheaper than traditional faxing.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
8. Anderson et al., US 20020194307 A1, has taught a method and system for remote document retrieval (designated device and requesting device could be different).

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai  
6NOV2008  
/Yves Dalencourt/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457